arXiv:1702.02982v1 [stat.ML] 9 Feb 2017

Fixing an error in Caponnetto and de Vito (2007)

Dougal J. Sutherland
Gatsby unit, University College London
dougal@gmail.com

February 2017

Abstract

The seminal paper of Caponnetto and de Vito (2007) provides minimax-optimal rates for kernel ridge regression in a very general setting. Its proof, however, contains an error in its bound on the effective dimensionality. In this note, we explain the mistake, provide a correct bound, and show that the main theorem remains true.

The mistake lies in Proposition 3's bound on the effective dimensionality $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$, particularly its dependence on the parameters of the family of distributions b and β. We discuss the mistake and provide a correct bound in Section 1. Its dependence on the regularization parameter λ, however, was correct, so the proof of Theorem 1 carries through with the exact same strategy. The proof was written in such a way, though, that it is not immediately obvious that it still holds for the corrected bound; we thus provide a more detailed explication of the proof, showing it is still valid.

This note will make little sense without a copy of the original paper at hand. Numbered theorems and equation references always refer to those of Caponnetto and de Vito (2007); equations in this document are labeled alphabetically.

A trivial correction First, we note a tiny mistake: Theorem 4 needs $C_\eta = 96 \log^2 \frac{6}{\eta}$, rather than $32 \log^2 \frac{6}{\eta}$, because the last line of its proof dropped the constant 3 in front of $S_1(\lambda, \mathbf{z})$ and $S_2(\lambda, \mathbf{z})$ in (36).

1 Bound on the effective dimensionality

Part of Proposition 3 is the claim that for $p \in \mathcal{P}(b, c)$, with $c \in [1, 2]$ and $b \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\mathcal{N}(\lambda) \le \frac{\beta b}{b-1} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{b}}. \tag{a}$$

The argument starts like this:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}(\lambda) &= \operatorname{Tr}\left[(T + \lambda I)^{-1} T\right] \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{t_n}{t_n + \lambda} \\
&\le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta / n^b}{\beta / n^b + \lambda} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta}{\beta + \lambda n^b} && \text{(b)} \\
&\le \int_0^\infty \frac{\beta}{\beta + \lambda x^b} \, \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \lambda^{-\frac{1}{b}} \int_0^\infty \frac{\beta}{\beta + \tau^b} \, \mathrm{d}\tau, && \text{(c)}
\end{aligned}$$

with (b) following from Definition 1 (iii), the next line's upper bound by an integral true since $x \mapsto \frac{\beta}{\beta+\lambda x^b}$ is decreasing, and then doing a change of variables to $\tau^b = \lambda x^b$.

But then the paper claims without further justification that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\beta + \tau^b}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \leq \frac{b}{b-1}. \tag{d}$$

In fact, (d) is incorrect: as $\beta \to 0$, the integral approaches the divergent integral $\int_0^\infty \tau^{-b}\mathrm{d}\tau$, but $\frac{b}{b-1}$ clearly does not depend on β. We can instead compute the true value of the integral:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\beta + \tau^b}\mathrm{d}\tau &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1/\beta}{1 + \left(\tau\beta^{-\frac{1}{b}}\right)^b}\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &= \beta^{-1}\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{1+u^b}\beta^{\frac{1}{b}}\,\mathrm{d}u \\ &= \beta^{\frac{1-b}{b}}\frac{\pi/b}{\sin(\pi/b)}.\end{aligned} \tag{e}$$

Using (e) in (c), we get a correct lower bound:

$$\mathcal{N}(\lambda) \leq \beta^{\frac{1}{b}}\frac{\pi/b}{\sin(\pi/b)}\lambda^{-\frac{1}{b}}. \tag{f}$$

(f) has the same dependence on λ as (a), but the dependence on β and b differs.

To demonstrate, we now plot the sum (b) (green, middle), the correct upper bound (f) (blue, top), and the purported upper bound (a) obtained via (d) (orange, bottom) for $\beta = 0.1, \lambda = 10^{-3}$.



2 Consequences in Theorem 1

Though it isn't obvious at first, the proof of Theorem 1 depends on the $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$ bound only in its rate on λ, which was indeed correct: thus the proof of Theorem 1 remains valid. We now restate the relevant parts of the proof of Theorem 1 in a way that makes this lack of dependence more explicit.

Theorem 4 gives us that for any any $\eta \in (0,1)$, with probability greater than $1-\eta$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] \leq C_\eta \left(\mathcal{A}(\lambda) + \frac{\kappa^2}{\ell^2 \lambda} \mathcal{B}(\lambda) + \frac{\kappa}{\ell \lambda} \mathcal{A}(\lambda) + \frac{\kappa M^2}{\ell^2 \lambda} + \frac{\Sigma^2}{\ell} \mathcal{N}(\lambda) \right),$$

provided that

$$\ell \geq \frac{2 C_\eta \kappa}{\lambda} \mathcal{N}(\lambda) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda \leq \|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}.$$

Define Q as

$$Q = \begin{cases} \beta^{\frac{1}{b}} \frac{\pi/b}{\sin(\pi/b)} & b < \infty \\ \beta & b = \infty \end{cases},$$

so that, from Proposition 3 and (f),

$$\mathcal{A}(\lambda) \leq \lambda^c \|T^{\frac{1-c}{2}} f_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \qquad \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \leq \lambda^{c-1} \|T^{\frac{1-c}{2}} f_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \qquad \mathcal{N}(\lambda) \leq Q \lambda^{-\frac{1}{b}}.$$

Plugging in these rates and $\|T^{\frac{1-c}{2}} f_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq R$ from Definition 1 (ii), we have that

$$\mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] \leq C_\eta \left(R\lambda^c + \kappa^2 R \frac{\lambda^{c-2}}{\ell^2} + \kappa R \frac{\lambda^{c-1}}{\ell} + \kappa M^2 \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{\ell^2} + \Sigma^2 Q \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{b}}}{\ell} \right) \tag{g}$$

$$\text{as long as} \qquad \ell \geq 2 C_\eta \kappa Q \lambda^{-\frac{b+1}{b}} \tag{h}$$

$$\text{and} \qquad \lambda \leq \|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}.$$

Note that for $b = \infty$, nothing has changed from the paper. Thus the proofs (which were not written explicitly in the paper) remain the same. We thus assume $b < \infty$.

2.1 $c > 1$

When $c > 1$, let

$$\ell_\eta \geq (2 C_\eta \kappa Q)^{\frac{bc+1}{b(c-1)}},$$

so that for any $\ell \geq \ell_\eta$ we have

$$\ell^{\frac{b(c-1)}{bc+1}} \geq 2 C_\eta \kappa Q.$$

Define $\lambda_\ell = \ell^{-\frac{b}{bc+1}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 2 C_\eta \kappa Q \lambda_\ell^{-\frac{b+1}{b}} &= 2 C_\eta \kappa Q \left(\ell^{-\frac{b}{bc+1}} \right)^{-\frac{b+1}{b}} \\ &= 2 C_\eta \kappa Q \ell^{\frac{b+1}{bc+1}} \\ &= 2 C_\eta \kappa Q \ell^{-\frac{b(c-1)}{bc+1}} \ell^{\frac{b+1}{bc+1} + \frac{b(c-1)}{bc+1}} \\ &\leq \ell^{\frac{b+1}{bc+1} + \frac{bc-b}{bc+1}} = \ell, \end{aligned}$$

so that (h) holds for $\lambda = \lambda_\ell$, and therefore (g) holds with probability at least $1-\eta$ as long as $\lambda_\ell \leq \|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}$. By Definition 1 (iii), the latter is at least α; thus this condition is met as long as

$$\lambda_\ell = \ell^{-\frac{b}{bc+1}} \leq \alpha \qquad \text{i.e. } \ell \geq \alpha^{-\frac{bc+1}{b}}.$$

We thus don't have to worry about it in the asymptotics. Plugging λ_ℓ into (g), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] &\leq C_\eta \left(R\lambda_\ell^c + \kappa^2 R \frac{\lambda_\ell^{c-2}}{\ell^2} + \kappa R \frac{\lambda_\ell^{c-1}}{\ell} + \kappa M^2 \frac{\lambda_\ell^{-1}}{\ell^2} + \Sigma^2 Q \frac{\lambda_\ell^{-\frac{1}{b}}}{\ell} \right) \\ &= C_\eta \left(R\ell^{-\frac{bc}{bc+1}} + \kappa^2 R \ell^{-\frac{b(c-2)}{bc+1} - 2} + \kappa R \ell^{-\frac{b(c-1)}{bc+1} - 1} + \kappa M^2 \ell^{\frac{b}{bc+1} - 2} + \Sigma^2 Q \ell^{\frac{b}{b(bc+1)} - 1} \right) \\ &= C_\eta \left(R\ell^{-\frac{bc}{bc+1}} + \kappa^2 R \ell^{-\frac{3bc-2b+2}{bc+1}} + \kappa R \ell^{-\frac{2bc-b+1}{bc+1}} + \kappa M^2 \ell^{\frac{b-2bc-2}{bc+1}} + \Sigma^2 Q \ell^{-\frac{bc}{bc+1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$3bc - 2b + 2 = bc + 2b(c-1) + 2 > bc$$
$$2bc - b + 1 = bc + b(c-1) + 1 > bc$$
$$2bc - b + 2 = bc + b(c-1) + 2 > bc.$$

Thus for large ℓ the $\ell^{-\frac{bc}{bc+1}}$ terms dominate, and so we have that

$$\mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] \leq 2C_\eta D \ell^{-\frac{bc}{bc+1}} \qquad \forall \ell \geq \ell_\eta,$$

where D is some complex function of R, κ, M, Σ, β, b, and c. Letting $\tau = 2C_\eta D = 192D \log^2 \frac{6}{\eta}$ and solving for η, we get $\eta_\tau = 6e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\tau}{192D}}}$. Thus

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{z}\sim\rho^\ell}\left[\mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda_\ell}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] > \tau \ell^{-\frac{bc}{bc+1}}\right] \leq \eta_\tau \qquad \forall \ell \leq \ell_{\eta_\tau},$$

and so

$$\limsup_{\ell\to\infty} \sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{P}(b,c)} \Pr_{\mathbf{z}\sim\rho^\ell}\left[\mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda_\ell}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] > \tau \ell^{-\frac{bc}{bc+1}}\right] \leq \eta_\tau,$$

and since $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \eta_\tau = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} 6e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\tau}{192D}}} = 0$, we have as desired that

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \limsup_{\ell\to\infty} \sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{P}(b,c)} \Pr_{\mathbf{z}\sim\rho^\ell}\left[\mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda_\ell}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] > \tau \ell^{-\frac{bc}{bc+1}}\right] = 0.$$

2.1.1 $c = 1$

Here we define $\lambda_\ell = \left(\frac{\log \ell}{\ell}\right)^{\frac{b}{b+1}}$, so that the ℓ requirement of (h) is

$$\ell \geq 2C_\eta \kappa Q \frac{\ell}{\log \ell},$$

that is,

$$\ell \geq \exp\left(2C_\eta \kappa Q\right),$$

so choosing $\ell_\eta = \exp\left(2C_\eta \kappa Q\right)$ suffices.

As in the $c > 1$ case, plugging λ_ℓ into (g) obtains that as long as $\ell \geq \ell_\eta$ (and $\lambda_\ell \leq \alpha$),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] &\leq C_\eta \left(R\lambda_\ell + \kappa^2 R \frac{\lambda_\ell^{-1}}{\ell^2} + \kappa R \frac{1}{\ell} + \kappa M^2 \frac{\lambda_\ell^{-1}}{\ell^2} + \Sigma^2 Q \frac{\lambda_\ell^{-\frac{1}{b}}}{\ell} \right) \\
&= C_\eta \left(R \left(\frac{\log \ell}{\ell}\right)^{\frac{b}{b+1}} + \kappa^2 R (\log \ell)^{\frac{-b}{b+1}} \ell^{\frac{b}{b+1}-2} + \kappa R \ell^{-1} + \kappa M^2 (\log \ell)^{-\frac{b}{b+1}} \ell^{\frac{b}{b+1}-2} + \Sigma^2 Q (\log \ell)^{-\frac{1}{b+1}} \ell^{\frac{1}{b+1}-1} \right) \\
&= C_\eta \left(R \left(\frac{\log \ell}{\ell}\right)^{\frac{b}{b+1}} + \kappa^2 R (\log \ell)^{\frac{-b}{b+1}} \ell^{-\frac{b+2}{b+1}} + \kappa R \ell^{-1} + \kappa M^2 (\log \ell)^{-\frac{b}{b+1}} \ell^{-\frac{b+2}{b+1}} + \Sigma^2 Q (\log \ell)^{-\frac{1}{b+1}} \ell^{-\frac{b}{b+1}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The $\ell^{-\frac{b}{b+1}}$ terms dominate, and so we can find a value D' such that

$$\mathcal{E}[f_{\mathbf{z}}^{\lambda}] - \mathcal{E}[f_{\mathcal{H}}] \leq 2C_\eta D' \ell^{-\frac{b}{b+1}} \qquad \forall \ell \geq \ell_\eta,$$

and the result follows by the same reasoning.

References

Caponnetto, A. and E. de Vito (2007). "Optimal Rates for the Regularized Least-Squares Algorithm". In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 7.3, pp. 331–368. DOI: 10.1007/s10208-006-0196-8.